

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-30 are pending in the present application.

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed March 21, 2006. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 12-16, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), claims 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hurst in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,493,339 issued to Birch et al ("Birch"); he also rejected claims 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hurst and an Official Notice.

In addition, the Examiner indicated allowable subject matter for claims 10 and 11 if they are rewritten in independent form including the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant has cancelled claim 10 (claims 17 and 18 were withdrawn earlier), amended claims 1, 11, and added claims 21 -30. Applicant submits that the newly added claims 21-30 introduce no new matter. Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

**I. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated claims 10 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has rewritten claim 10 as independent claim 1 which includes all the limitations of the base claim 1. As for claim 11, applicant has amended claim 11 to include all the limitations of the base claim 1. Applicant believes that these independent claims 1, 11, and their dependent claims are in

condition for allowance as stated by the Examiner in the Office Action. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for these allowable claims.

**II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 12-16, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,523,227 issued to Hurst ("Hurst"). In view of the amendments made above, which includes all of the limitations of the base claim 1 with objected claims 10 and 11, the rejection of claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 12-16 is now moot. Furthermore, claims 21-30 are added as dependent claims to the already allowable claim 11 (with all limitations of claim 1).

Applicant has amended claim 19 to include limitations in objected claim 11, Applicant believes the independent claim 19 and its dependent claim 20 are distinguishable over the cited prior art references. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

**III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hurst in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,493,339 issued to Birch et al ("Birch"); and claims 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Hurst and an Official Notice. In view of the above amendments made above, the rejections are moot. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the amendments and remarks made above, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully solicited. If it is believed that a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of the present application, or clarify matters with regard to its allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any required fees associated with this Communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 04-1175.

Respectfully submitted,

DISCOVISION ASSOCIATES

Dated: 06/20/06

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Caroline T. Do, Esq.  
Reg. No. 47,529

DISCOVISION ASSOCIATES  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT  
2265 E. 220<sup>th</sup> Street  
Long Beach, CA 90810  
(310) 952-3300